

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

TOMAHAWK MANUFACTURING, INC.,
 et al.,

Case No. 2:23-cv-01007-APG-NJK

Plaintiff(s),

Order

v.

[Docket No. 86]

SPHERICAL INDUSTRIES, INC., et al.,

Defendant(s).

Pending before the Court is Plaintiffs' renewed emergency motion for a protective order concerning the restriction on sensitive materials for experts who are themselves competitors. Docket No. 86.

Plaintiffs' motion is supported by a single legal citation articulating the uncontroversial position that the Court has broad discretion to fashion a protective order. *Id.* at 3. The motion contains no legal authority whatsoever regarding the actual issue in dispute, however, despite the fact that cursory legal research reveals a number of decisions on this issue from courts within the Ninth Circuit.¹ The parties were required to conduct this legal research themselves and to discuss it during the meet-and-confer. *See, e.g., Nevada Power Co. v. Monsanto Co.*, 151 F.R.D. 118, 120 (D. Nev. 1993). Whether they did so is unclear from the papers. Such legal research also should have been discussed in the motion practice itself. *See, e.g., On Demand Direct Response, LLC v. McCart-Pollak*, 2018 WL 2014067, at *1 n.2 (D. Nev. Apr. 30, 2018) (explaining that discovery motions are not exempt from the requirement to present well-developed legal argument). Accordingly, the renewed emergency motion for protective order is **DENIED** without prejudice.

¹ As explained by former United States Magistrate Judge Peggy A. Leen, a magistrate judge is not "the Maytag repairman of federal judges desperately hoping for something to do." *Mazzeo v. Gibbons*, 2010 WL 3020021, at *1 (D. Nev. July 27, 2010). The Court declines to provide its own legal research to the parties herein because that is the job of counsel in the first instance.

1 If the parties have not discussed the case law on the specific issue in dispute, then they
2 must engage in further conferral efforts by 5:00 p.m. on September 8, 2023. Any renewed motion
3 must address such legal authority and must be filed by September 11, 2023. The response thereto
4 must be filed by September 13, 2023, and any reply must be filed by September 14, 2023.²

5 IT IS SO ORDERED.

6 Dated: September 6, 2023

7 
8 _____
9 Nancy J. Koppe
10 United States Magistrate Judge
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 _____
28 ² Counsel should note that any briefing deadlines automatically generated by CMECF do
not apply and, instead, the deadlines set herein govern. Local Rule IC 3-1(d).